

Serial No. 09/813,706
Amdt. dated May 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PN01003AA

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 17 remain in this application. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11 and 17 have been amended.

Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,185,204 to Voit ("Voit patent"). Again, as stated in the previous response, Applicants presume that claims 2, 3, 5 through 8, and 11 through 16 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over the Voit patent.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 17, as amended, provide, *inter alia*, several distinctions from the Voit patent. First, the assignment of the long lived IP address is caused by activation of a mobile station in a network. Second, the mobile station uses IP for pushed content and/or services. Third, operating the mobile station over a radio network. Fourth, there is a causal relationship between the initiation of the push session and the assigning of the dynamic public IP address. In contrast, the Voit patent does not describe or suggest the above elements of independent claims 1, 10 and 17, as amended. Therefore, claims 1, 10 and 17 distinguish patentably from the Voit patent.

Claims 2 through 9 and 11 through 16 depend from, and include all limitations of, independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 through 9 and 11 through 16 distinguish patentably from the Voit patent for the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 10.

Serial No. 09/813,706
Amdt. dated May 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PN01003AA

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 through 17 are respectfully requested.

New claims 18 through 20 cover certain aspects of the Applicants' invention. In particular, new claims 18 through 20 provide, *inter alia*, routing of contents and/or services via a Gateway GPRS Support Node or a Packet Data Serving Node. Allowance of new claims 18 through 20 is believed to be warranted.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any


Serial No. 09/813,706
Amdt. dated May 17, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PN01003AA

questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Dorenbosch, Jheroen P., et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048

 May 17, 2005
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350